IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTY FOURTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO: 13577 of 2005

Between:

Narreddy Sivarami Reddy, S/o. Late Muni Reddy,
R/o. 15-23, Panchali Nagar, Renigunta Village (M), Chittoor district.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The District Collector, Chittoor District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chittoor .
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Renigunta, Chittoor District.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ or direction more particularly one in the nature of Mandamus or any other appropriate Writ declaring the inaction of the Respondent in disposing the Representations of the Petitioner as illegal, arbitrary, being violation of Articles 14, 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the Respondent to dispose of my representations dated 28-3-2005, 10-6-2005, 15-6-2005 and to call for all the records pertaining to the revenue records.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.RAMANA ALLU

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR REVENUE

The Court at the stage of admission made the following:

-

ORDER:

This writ petition is filed to declare the inaction of the respondent in disposing the representations of the petitioner as illegal and arbitrary, and consequently, to direct the respondent to dispose of the representations of the petitioner dated 28-3-2005, 10-6-2005, 15-6-2005 and to call for all the records pertaining to the revenue records.

2. At the time of hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to give the extents of lands in the petitioner's occupation and he is not able to mention the GOs under which he is seeking the relief, except the existing GOs. I see no reason to entertain this writ petition, as there are inconsistent statements in the affidavit filed by the petitioner. At one stage, he is saying about the occupation of the poramboke land, and later, about assigning survey numbers to the same land. The petitioner is not the person, who applied the Registrar for registration of the Society. Therefore, I am doubting the *bonafides* of the petitioner. Therefore, this writ petition is liable to be dismissed for not furnishing any information and making inconsistent statements in the affidavit.

3. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

24th June, 2005 _____

SKM E.DHARMA RAO, J

To

1 The District Collector, Chittoor District.
2 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chittoor .
3 The Mandal Revenue Officer, Renigunta, Chittoor District.

4 Two C.Cs. to G.P. for Revenue, High Court Buildings,

High Court of A.P., Hyderabad. (OUT)

5 Two CD copies